arXiv:1412.3566v3 [cond-mat.quant-gas] 6 Sep 2015

Revealing the origin of super-Efimov states in the hyperspherical formalism

Chao Gao
Institute for Advanced Study, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China

Jia Wang
Department of Physics, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut 06269, USA

Zhenhua Yu*
Institute for Advanced Study, Tsinghua University, Beijing, 100084, China

(Dated: September 8, 2015)

Super-Efimov states are a new kind of universal three-body bound states predicted for three identical fermions with p-wave resonant interactions in two dimensions by a recent field-theoretic calculation [Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 235301 (2013)]. The binding energies of these states obey a dramatic double exponential scaling $E_n = E_* \exp(-2e^{\pi n/s_0+\theta})$ with universal scaling $s_0 = 4/3$ and three-body parameters E_* and θ. We use the hyperspherical formalism and show that the super-Efimov states originate from an emergent effective potential $-1/4\rho^2 - (s_0^2+1/4)/\rho^2 \ln^2(\rho)$ at large hyperradius ρ. Moreover, for pairwise interparticle potentials with van der Waals tails, our numerical calculation indicates that the three-body parameters E_* and θ are also universal and the ground super-Efimov state shall cross the threshold when the 2D p-wave scattering area is about $-42.0\, l_{\rm vdW}^2$ with $l_{\rm vdW}$ the van der Waals length.

A landmark result of few-body physics is the Efimov bound states predicted theoretically in 1970 for three-body systems with s-wave resonant interactions in three dimensions [1]. The binding energy of the nth Efimov state scales as $E_n \sim \tilde{E}_* e^{-2\pi n/\tilde{s}_0}$ with $\tilde{s}_0$ a universal number and $\tilde{E}_*$ the three-body parameter [1–3]. This peculiar scaling is given rise to by an emergent effective potential of the form $-(\tilde{s}_0^2+1/4)/\rho^2$ in the hyperspherical formalism of the three-body problem at large hyperradius ρ. Only recently, extreme experimental controllability and versatility of ultra-cold atomic gases [4–6] provides a unique opportunity to detect evidences of the Efimov states for the very first time in atomic systems. Experimentalists succeeded in realizing s-wave resonant interactions in ultra-cold atomic gases by the technique of Feshbach resonance [7], and revealed the Efimov physics through measuring atom loss rate due to three-body recombinations [8–14], atom-dimer inelastic collisions [15, 16] and radio-frequency spectroscopy [17, 18]. Further studies showed that even the three-body parameter $\tilde{E}_*$ which determines the absolute energy levels of the Efimov states has a universal behavior for different atomic species [20–25].

The quest for universal physics at resonances beyond the paradigm of the Efimov states brought about a recent quantum field theory calculation predicting that universal bound states exist for three identical fermions with p-wave resonant interactions in two dimensions [26]. These new states have angular momentum $\ell = \pm 1$ and are called "super-Efimov" due to the fascinating scaling of their binding energies $E_n = E_* \exp(-2e^{n\pi/s_0+\theta})$ with $s_0 = 4/3$ a universal number, and E_* and θ the three-body parameters. While the prediction of the super-Efimov states agrees with a recently proved theorem [27], understanding the origin of such universal states requests further investigation.

In this work, we use the hyperspherical formalism to study three identical fermions with p-wave resonant interactions in two dimensions. In the angular momentum $\ell = \pm 1$ channel, we show that the super-Efimov states are due to an emergent effective potential $U_{\rm eff} \sim -1/4\rho^2 - (s_0^2+1/4)/\rho^2 \ln^2(\rho)$ in the large hyperradius ρ limit. We extract s_0 from $U_{\rm eff}$ calculated numerically at the first three p-wave resonances of three different kinds of model potentials; the extracted values of s_0 agree well with 4/3 as predicted by the field theory [26]. For pairwise interparticle potentials with a van der Waals tail, the numerically obtained binding energies of the lowest two super-Efimov states indicate that the three-body parameters E_* and θ are also universal; the ground super-Efimov state is predicted to emerge at the threshold when the 2D scattering area is about $-42.0\, l_{\rm vdW}^2$ with $l_{\rm vdW}$ the van de Waals length.

Hyperspherical formalism.— We consider three identical fermions with coordinates $\mathbf{r}_1$, $\mathbf{r}_2$ and $\mathbf{r}_3$ interacting pairwisely through a central potential $V(r)$ of finite range r_0 in two dimensions. The potential is fine tuned such that it is at a p-wave resonance. We introduce the Jacobi coordinates $\mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{r}_j - \mathbf{r}_k$ and $\mathbf{y}_i = 2[\mathbf{r}_i - (\mathbf{r}_j + \mathbf{r}_k)/2]/\sqrt{3}$, where $\{i, j, k\}$ takes the values of $\{1, 2, 3\}$ cyclically. The hyperspherical radius is given by $\rho = \sqrt{\mathbf{x}_i^2 + \mathbf{y}_i^2}$, and the corresponding hyperspherical angles $\Omega_i = \{\alpha_i, \theta_{\mathbf{x}_i}, \theta_{\mathbf{y}_i}\}$ with $\alpha_i = \tan^{-1}(x_i/y_i)$, $\theta_{\mathbf{x}_i}$ ($\theta_{\mathbf{y}_i}$) the polar angle of $\mathbf{x}_i$ ($\mathbf{y}_i$) [28]. After separating out the center of mass part, we expand the wave-function of the system in terms of

any set of hyperangles Ω_i as

$$\Psi = \sum_\mu \rho^{-3/2} f_\mu(\rho)\Phi_\mu(\rho,\Omega_i). \quad (1)$$

The angular part $\Phi_\mu(\rho,\Omega_i)$ is required to satisfy the eigenequation

$$\left[\hat{\Lambda}^2 + m\rho^2 \sum_{j=1}^{3} V(\rho\sin\alpha_j)\right]\Phi_\mu(\rho,\Omega_i) = \lambda_\mu(\rho)\Phi_\mu(\rho,\Omega_i), \quad (2)$$

with m the mass of each fermion. Here, the total angular momentum operator is given by [28]

$$\Lambda^2 = -\frac{\partial^2}{\partial\alpha_i^2} - 2\cot(2\alpha_i)\frac{\partial}{\partial\alpha_i} + \frac{L_{\mathbf{x}_i}^2}{\sin^2\alpha_i} + \frac{L_{\mathbf{y}_i}^2}{\cos^2\alpha_i}. \quad (3)$$

Hereafter, we use units such that $\hbar = m = 1$. Consequently, the hyperradial part satisfies the coupled equations of eigenenergy E as [28]

$$\left[-\frac{d^2}{d\rho^2} - \frac{1}{4\rho^2} + U_\mu(\rho) - Q_{\mu\mu} - E\right] f_\mu(\rho) = \sum_{\nu(\neq\mu)} \left[2P_{\mu\nu}\frac{d}{d\rho} + Q_{\mu\nu}\right] f_\nu(\rho), \quad (4)$$

with $U_\mu(\rho) = [\lambda_\mu(\rho)+1]/\rho^2$. The couplings $P_{\mu\nu} = \langle\Phi_\mu|\partial_\rho|\Phi_\nu\rangle$ and $Q_{\mu\nu} = \langle\Phi_\mu|\partial_\rho^2|\Phi_\nu\rangle$, with $\langle\dots\rangle$ standing for the integration over the hyperangles, are expected to be negligible for $\mu \neq \nu$ in the large ρ limit [28]; as Eq. (4) becomes decoupled, the three-body problem is reduced to a one dimensional equation, and the eigenstates with $E \to 0^-$ shall be governed by the effective potential

$$U_{\rm eff}(\rho) \equiv -\frac{1}{4\rho^2} + U_0 - Q_{00} \quad (5)$$

of the shallowest attractive channel $\mu = 0$ at large hyperradius.

We focus on the states with total angular momentum $|\ell| = |\ell_{\mathbf{x}_i} + \ell_{\mathbf{y}_i}| = 1$ for which the super-Efimov states were predicted [26]. We solve the Faddeev equations derived from Eq. (2) in the regime $r_0/\rho \ll 1$ [28], and find for the shallowest attractive channel

$$\lambda_0(\rho) + 1 = -\frac{Y}{\ln(\rho/r_0)} + O\left(\frac{1}{\ln^2(\rho/r_0)}\right), \quad (6)$$

where the dimensionless parameter Y is given by

$$Y = -1 - \frac{\int_0^\infty dr r^2 V(r) u_0^2(r)}{\lim_{r\to\infty}[r u_0(r)^2]} \quad (7)$$

with $u_0(r)$ the zero energy p-wave two-body reduced radial wave function satisfying

$$\left[-\partial_r^2 + \frac{3}{4r^2} + V(r)\right] u_0(r) = 0. \quad (8)$$

The radial effective potential $V(r)+3/4r^2$ has a centrifugal barrier. An alternative expression is [29, 30]

$$Y = \frac{\int_0^\infty dr r \left[\partial_r(u_0(r)\sqrt{r})\right]^2}{\lim_{r\to\infty}[\sqrt{r}u_0(r)]^2}, \quad (9)$$

which shows Y positive definite. Note that a similar logarithmic structure also appears in the scattering T-matrix in two dimensions [31].

Effective potential.— In the regime $r_0/\rho \ll 1$, if Q_{00} can be neglected, $U_{\rm eff} + 1/4\rho^2 \sim -Y/\rho^2\ln(\rho/r_0)$ would give rise to shallow bound states whose energies E_n scale as $\ln|E_n| \sim -(n\pi)^2/2Y$. Surprisingly Ref. [29] argued that $Q_{00} \sim -Y/\rho^2\ln(\rho/r_0)$; the leading orders of U_0 and Q_{00} shall cancel. This cancellation would result in $U_{\rm eff} + 1/4\rho^2 = U_0 - Q_{00} \sim 1/\rho^2\ln^2(\rho/r_0)$ in which case super-Efimov states become possible.

The involved hyperangle integral of Q_{00} seems to preclude evaluating it analytically to order $1/\rho^2\ln^2(\rho/r_0)$. Hence we obtain $U_{\rm eff}$ by calculating U_0 and Q_{00} numerically with three kinds of model potentials: the Lennard-Jones potential (LJ) $V_{\rm LJ}(r) = -V_0\left[(r_0/r)^6 - \eta^6(r_0/r)^{12}\right]$, the Gaussian potential (GS) $V_{\rm GS}(r) = -V_0\exp\left[-(r/r_0)^2\right]$, and the Pöschl-Teller potential (PT) $V_{\rm PT}(r) = -V_0{\rm sech}^2(r/r_0)$. The model potentials are all tuned at a p-wave resonance. We solve Eq. (2) numerically by using the modified Smith-Whitten coordinates, which have been successfully applied to three-body systems in both three dimensions [32–36] and two dimensions [37, 38]. The details of constructing the Smith-Whitten coordinates and the corresponding hyperspherical representation can be found in Refs. [37] and [39].

Figure (1) shows the resultant numerical results of $U_{\rm eff}$ at the first three p-wave resonances of the three model potentials, which all converge to a universal form $-1/4\rho^2 - [(4/3)^2+1/4]/\rho^2\ln^2(\rho/r_0)$ when ρ/r_0 is large. We fit the data of $\rho^2 U_{\rm eff} + 1/4$ by the series $-\sum_{n=2}^4 c_n \ln^{-n}(\rho/r_0)$ in the range $\rho/r_0 \in [30, 500]$. We define $s_0^2 \equiv c_2 - 1/4$. Table (I) shows that all fitted values of s_0 agree with $4/3$ within $\sim 4\%$. Likewise we fit the data for $\rho^2 U_0$ and $\rho^2 Q_{00}$ separately by $-\sum_{n=1}^3 c_n \ln^{-n}(\rho/r_0)$ in the same range. As shown in Tab. (I), fitted c_1 of both U_0 and Q_{00} and Y calculated by the analytic result Eq. (7) show good agreement within $\sim 6\%$, the difference between which nevertheless quantifies the overall error of our numerical data and the fitting scheme.

Our calculation indicates that when ρ/r_0 is large, the three-body system is subject to an emergent effective potential

$$U_{\rm eff}(\rho) = -\frac{1}{4\rho^2} - \frac{s_0^2 + 1/4}{\rho^2\ln^2(\rho/r_0)}. \quad (10)$$



FIG. 1: Numerical results for the effective potential $U_{\rm eff}$ defined in Eq. (5) for three different two-body model potentials from top to bottom: Lennard-Jones (LJ), Gaussian (GS), Pöschl-Teller (PT). The red solid lines are for the first p-wave resonances of the three potentials, and the blue dash-dotted ones for the second, and the green dashed ones for the third. The black dash-dot-dotted lines are $\rho^2 U_{\rm eff}+1/4 = -[(4/3)^2+1/4]/\ln^2(\rho/r_0)$.

TABLE I: The parameter Y calculated from Eq. (7) and the fitted parameters to the numerical results for different model potentials from the first to the third p-wave resonance.

Resonance	Y	c_1 of U_0	c_1 of Q_{00}	s_0 of $U_{\rm eff}$
LJ 1st	1.068	1.063	1.071	1.339
LJ 2nd	1.939	1.979	1.960	1.348
LJ 3rd	2.393	2.519	2.452	1.381
GS 1st	0.484	0.475	0.484	1.341
GS 2nd	1.636	1.654	1.641	1.355
GS 3rd	2.781	2.949	2.872	1.393
PT 1st	0.437	0.431	0.437	1.350
PT 2nd	1.209	1.209	1.209	1.349
PT 3rd	1.880	1.928	1.885	1.367

Given such a potential, one can use the WKB approximation (or other methods) to show that the binding energies of shallow bound states have the super-Efimov form $E_n = E_* \exp(-2e^{\pi n/s_0+\theta})$. Our numerical results of s_0 agrees well with the universal scaling factor 4/3 predicted by Ref. [26]. Thus we show that the universal super-Efimov states originate from the universal effective potential Eq. (10).

The above conclusion is based on the adiabatic approximation by neglecting inter-channel couplings [cf. Eq. (5)]. For the Lennard-Jones, Gaussian, and Pöschl-Teller two-body model potentials, we find numerically that the inter-couplings between the super-Efimov channel $\mu = 0$ and other channels $\nu \neq 0$ have the asymptotic behaviors $P_{0\nu} \sim 1/\rho\ln^2(\rho)$ and $Q_{0\nu} \sim 1/\rho^2\ln^2(\rho)$ when ρ is large. The effects of these nonzero inter-channel couplings on the super-Efimov states can be evaluated perturbatively in the following way. First we solve Eq. (4) at zero order by neglecting all the inter-channel couplings. The $\mu = 0$ channel would produce the super-Efimov bound state solutions $f_0^{(0)}(\rho)$ with negative eigenenergies E while apart from any accidental coincidences, in any other channels $\nu \neq 0$ there is only a trivial solution $f_\nu^{(0)}(\rho) = 0$ for the same energies E. Next we substitute $f_0^{(0)}(\rho)$ into Eq. (4) and solve $f_\nu^{(1)}(\rho)$ for $\nu \neq 0$ to the first order of the inter-channel couplings. In the regime $r_0 \ll \rho \ll 1/|E|$, $f_0^{(0)}(\rho) \sim \sqrt{\rho\ln(\rho/r_0)}\cos\{s_0\ln[\ln(\rho/r_0)]+\varphi\}$ with φ a phase shift [29], which indicates $f_\nu^{(1)}(\rho) \sim f_0^{(0)}(\rho)/\ln^2(\rho/r_0)$. Thus in Eq. (4) the off diagonal terms are expected to be $[2P_{0\nu}(d/d\rho) + Q_{0\nu}]f_\nu^{(1)}(\rho) \sim f_0^{(0)}/\rho^2\ln^4(\rho/r_0)$, negligible compared with the diagonal term $U_{\rm eff}(\rho)f_0^{(0)}(\rho)$; the adiabatic approximation is justified in the regime $\rho \to \infty$.

Three-body parameters.— In the case of Efimov states, the three-body parameter $\tilde{E}_*$ is originally believed to be *not universal* and to be determined by short-range interaction details [2]. Surprisingly recent experiments of ultra-cold atomic gases found $\tilde{E}_*$ rather universal (in van der Waals units) [20]. Subsequent theoretical calculations [21–25] inspired by this new discovery soon confirmed that when the long range tail of the two-body interaction is dominated by the van der Waals form $V(r) \to -C_6/r^6$, $\tilde{E}_*$ is universally determined by the van der Waals length $l_{\rm vdW} \equiv C_6^{1/4}/2$ or equivalently the van der Waals energy $E_{\rm vdW} \equiv -1/l_{\rm vdW}^2$. This universality of $\tilde{E}_*$ is attributed to the suppressed probability of finding two particles at short distances where $V(r)$ shows a deep attractive well [21]. It is natural to ask the question: whether the three-body parameters for super-Efimov states E_* and θ are also universal, if the two-body interaction has the long-range tail $-C_6/r^6$?

We use two-body model potentials $V_k^n(r) = -C_6/r^6\left[1-(\beta_n/r)^k\right]$ to study the three-body parameters numerically. The short-range parameter β_n is tuned such that there are n p-wave two-body bound states including the shallowest one at threshold. These two-body model potentials have the same long-range van der Waals tail, but very different short-range interactions determined by β_n and k. The first evidence of universality is the effective potential $U_{\rm eff}$ at short range as shown in Fig. (2), where a universal repulsive core rises up at about $\rho \approx 2.2 l_{\rm vdW}$; it seems that the short range details of these different two-body model potentials have little effect on those of the three-body effective potential $U_{\rm eff}$. In plotting $U_{\rm eff}$ in Fig. (2), we have manually diabatized the curves to improve visualization. One example is shown in the inset of Fig. (2), where a sharp feature arising from an accidental crossing between the super-Efimov channel and another channel is manually eliminated. This kind of sharp features of $U_{\rm eff}$ at small ρ shall not be important for understanding low-energy three-body observables.

Applying the numerical treatment similar to Ref. [36],



FIG. 2: Universal effective potential $U_{\rm eff}$ for different two-body model potential V_k^n, with sharp avoid crossings manually diabatized in some cases to improve visualization. An example of the manual diabatization is shown in the inset for the model potential V_6^2. The sharp feature arising from an accidental crossing between two channels represented by the red dash-doted and the black dashed curves is manually eliminated to give the smooth green solid curve.



FIG. 3: Super-Efimov ground state energies E_g for different two-body model potentials V_k^n by full calculations. The error bars at $n = 2, 3$ are the decay rates of these states into atom-dimer states. The inset shows the three-body parameters θ and ξ calculated by the adiabatic approximation.

we calculate the three-body super-Efimov ground state energies E_g for different $V_k^n(r)$. When the model potentials $V_k^n(r)$ can support only one two-body bound state at threshold ($n = 1$), the super-Efimov channel is the lowest three-body channel; the super-Efimov states are *true* bound states and we obtain their eigenenergies by diagonalizing the Hamiltonian directly. When the model potentials support multiple two-body bound states ($n > 1$), deeper three-body channels (atom-dimer channels) exist, and the super-Efimov states become *quasi*-bound states. It is known that when there is a quasi-bound state buried in the continua, the scattering amplitude shows a Fano resonance due to the interference between the continuum states and the quasi-bound state [40]. In this case, we calculate the scattering cross sections for the deeper atom-dimer channels at energies close to those of the super-Efimov states, and locate resonances that can be fitted by a Fano lineshape. The resonance positions are interpreted as the super-Efimov state energies, and the widths of the resonances give rates of the super-Efimov states decaying into atom-dimer states.

The super-Efimov ground state energies obtained in the way described above are quite universal $E_g/E_{\rm vdW} \approx -0.05$ as shown in Fig. (3) and are interestingly close to the universal Efimov ground state energies [21], while small decay rates are found for $n = 2, 3$. In addition, we extrapolate $U_{\rm eff}$ to very large distances and calculate the energies $E_g^{\rm ad}$ and $E_1^{\rm ad}$ of both the ground and the first excited super-Efimov states for $V_k^1(r)$ within the adiabatic hyperspherical approximation (neglecting $P_{0\nu}$ and $Q_{0\nu}$ for $\nu \neq 0$). Note that possible decay rates can not be evaluated within this approximation. Table (II) shows that while the ground state energies $E_g^{\rm ad}$ have good agreement with the full calculations E_g, the first excited state energies $E_1^{\rm ad}$ have extremely small values (of order $10^{-14}E_{\rm vdW}$), implying that a full calculation for the first excited states will be extremely challenging. If we express the super-Efimov energies as $E/E_{\rm vdW} = \exp\left[-2\exp\left(4n\pi/3+\theta\right)+\xi\right]$, the three-body parameters θ and ξ [$\equiv \ln(-E_*/E_{\rm vdW})$] extracted from $E_g^{\rm ad}$ and $E_1^{\rm ad}$ are shown in the inset of Fig. (3) to be very universal.

We attribute the universality of θ and ξ to the mechanism similar as in the Efimov states, i.e., the probability of finding any pair of particles separated by less than $l_{\rm vdW}$ is greatly suppressed, implying that the short distance details of interactions have negligible effects [21]. For example, We calculate the zero energy reduced two-body wave-function $u_0(r)$ for the model potential $V_6^n(r)$ with $n = 1, 2, 3$. As shown in Fig. (4), we find that $u_0^2(r)$ has substantial magnitude in the range $1 < r/l_{\rm vdW} < 2$ inside the centrifugal barrier of the effective radial potential $V_6^n + 3/4r^2$, which is due to the resonant tunneling right at p-wave resonances. The zero energy reduced two-body wave-function is normalized as $u_0(r) = r^{-1/2}$ when $r \to \infty$. The further deep attractive well of $V_6^n + 3/4r^2$ strongly suppresses $u_0^2(r)$ to small values when $r < l_{\rm vdW}$, which can be understood by a semiclassical analysis as in the Efimov case [21].

Threshold crossing.— In ultra-cold atomic gases, the three-body recombination resonances observed experimentally in the vicinity of Feshbach resonances occur where Efimov state energies cross the three-body continuum threshold, and serve as first evidences of Efimov physics [8–14, 19]. Here we tune the depth of the Lennard-Jones two-body model potential around the nth p-wave resonance, and calculate the ground super-Efimov state energy E_g as a function of 2D p-wave scattering area



FIG. 4: Suppression of the zero energy two-body wave function u_0 at short distances. The thick curves are the radial probability of zero energy wave functions $u_0^2(r)$ for the model potential V_6^n with $n = 1, 2, 3$; the thin curves are the effective radial potential $V_6^n + 3/4r^2$. The black solid, red dashed and blue dash-dotted curves correspond to $n = 1, 2, 3$ respectively.



FIG. 5: The binding energy of the ground super-Efimov trimer state E_g versus the 2D p-wave scattering area A using the Lennard-Jones potential tuned around the nth p-wave resonance. The error bars of E_g for $n = 2, 3$ quantifies the finite lifetime of the state due to its decaying into atom-dimer states.

TABLE II: The super Efimov ground state energies E_g by full calculations and the ground state energies $E_g^{\rm ad}$ and the first excited energies $E_1^{\rm ad}$ calculated by the hyperspherical adiabatic approximation. Here $[n]$ denotes $\times 10^n$. θ and ξ are the two three-body parameters.

k	$E_g/E_{\rm vdW}$	$E_g^{\rm ad}/E_{\rm vdW}$	$E_1^{\rm ad}/E_{\rm vdW}$	θ	ξ
4	-3.941[-2]	-4.785[-2]	-1.995[-14]	-1.517	-2.601
6	-4.415[-2]	-4.429[-2]	-1.232[-14]	-1.502	-2.672
8	-4.651[-2]	-4.254[-2]	-0.969[-14]	-1.496	-2.709

A. [For small scattering wave vector q, the 2D p-wave scattering phase shift $\delta(q)$ is given by $\cot\delta(q) = -1/Aq^2$.] Figure (5) shows that when A is tuned to large and negative values, E_g becomes shallower and eventually hit the three-body continuum. Extrapolating E_g to the threshold, we find that the crossing point $A_g^{(-)}$ is at $-45.9\,l_{\rm vdW}^2$, $-42.1\,l_{\rm vdW}^2$, and $-42.0\,l_{\rm vdW}^2$ near the 1st, 2nd, and 3rd p-wave resonance respectively. The magnitude of $A_g^{(-)}$ complies with the linear dimension of the ground super-Efimov state at resonance. The convergence of $A_g^{(-)}$ to approximately $-42.0\,l_{\rm vdW}^2$ is reminiscent of the Efimov physics in which the three-body parameters becomes more universal for two-body potentials that can support more bound states [21]. Recent successful realization of "quasi" 2D Fermi gases [41–43] opens up the prospect of experimental study of the super-Efimov physics in atomic gases. It will be worth examining how the super-Efimov physics would be affected by the strong confinement applied to produce the "quasi" 2D gases in future investigations.

Acknowledgments.— We thank S. Moroz, Y. Nishida, H. Zhai, X. Cui, Z. Shi, S. Tan, Y. Castin, C.H. Greene, J.P. D'Incao and R. Côté for discussions. ZY acknowledges support from the INT program "Universality in Few-Body Systems: Theoretical Challenges and New Directions" (INT 14-1), during which part of the work was carried out. This work is supported by Tsinghua University Initiative Scientific Research Program, NSFC under Grant No. 11104157, No. 11474179, and No. 11204152, No. 11004118, No. 11174176, No. 11204153, and NKBRSFC under Grant No. 2011CB921500.

* Electronic address: huazhenyu2000@gmail.com

[1] V. Efimov, Phys. Lett. B **33** 563 (1970); Yad. Fiz. **12**, 1080 (1970) [Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **12**, 589 (1971)]; Nucl. Phys. A **210**, 157 (1973).
[2] E. Braaten, and H.-W. Hammer, Phys. Rep. **428**, 259 (2006).
[3] D. S. Petrov, arXiv:1206.5752.
[4] I. Bloch, J. Dalibard, and W. Zwerger, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 885 (2008).
[5] M. Saffman, T. G. Walker and K. Mølmer, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 2313 (2010).
[6] J. Dalibard, F. Gerbier, and G. Juzeliūnas, and P. Öhberg, Rev. Mod. Phys. **83**, 1523 (2011).
[7] C. Chin, R. Grimm, P. Julienne, and E. Tiesinga, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 1225 (2010).
[8] T. Kraemer, M. Mark, P. Waldburger, J.G. Danzl, C. Chin, B. Engeser, A.D. Lange, K. Pilch, A. Jaakkola, H.-C. Nägerl and R. Grimm, Nature **440**, 315 (2006).
[9] T. B. Ottenstein, T. Lompe, M. Kohnen, A.N. Wenz, and S. Jochim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 203202 (2008).
[10] S. E. Pollack, D. Dries, and R.G. Hulet, Science **326**, 1683 (2009).
[11] N. Gross, Z. Shotan, S. Kokkelmans, and L. Khaykovich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 163202 (2009).
[12] J. H. Huckans, J. R. Williams, E. L. Hazlett, R. W. Stites, and K. M. O'Hara, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 165302 (2009).
[13] J. R. Williams, E. L. Hazlett, J. H. Huckans, R. W. Stites,

Y. Zhang, and K. M. O'Hara, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 130404 (2009).
[14] R. J. Wild, P. Makotyn, J. M. Pino, E. A. Cornell, and D. S. Jin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 145305 (2012).
[15] S. Knoop, F. Ferlaino, M. Mark, M. Berninger, H. Schöbel, H.-C. Nägerl, R. Grimm, Nature Phys. **5**, 227 (2009).
[16] T. Lompe, T. B. Ottenstein, F. Serwane, K. Viering, A. N. Wenz, G. Zūrn, S. Jochim, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 103201 (2010).
[17] T. Lompe, T. B. Ottenstein, F. Serwane, A. N. Wenz, G. Zūrn, S. Jochim, Science **330**, 940 (2010).
[18] S. Nakajima, M. Horikoshi, T. Mukaiyama, P. Naidon, and M. Ueda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 143201 (2011).
[19] N. Gross, Z. Shotan, S. Kokkelmans, and L. Khaykovich, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 103203 (2010).
[20] M Berninger, A Zenesini, B. Huang, W. Harm, H.-C. Nägerl, F. Ferlaino, R. Grimm, P.S. Julienne, and J. M. Hutson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 120401 (2011).
[21] J. Wang, J. P. D'Incao, B.D. Esry, and C. H. Greene, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 263001 (2012).
[22] Y. Wang, J. Wang, J. P. D'Incao, and C.H. Greene, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 243201 (2012).
[23] C. Chin, arXiv:1111.1484.
[24] R. Schmidt, S. P. Rath, and W. Zwerger, Eur. Phys. J. B **85**,386 (2012).
[25] P. Naidon, S. Endo, and M. Ueda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 105301 (2014).
[26] Y. Nishida, S. Moroz, and D. T. Son, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 235301 (2013).
[27] D. K. Gridnev, J. Phys. A **47**, 505204 (2014).
[28] E. Nielsen, D. V. Fedorov, A. S. Jensen, and E. Garrido, Phys. Rep. **347**, 373 (2001).
[29] A.G. Volosniev, D. V. Fedorov, A. S. Jensen and N. T. Zinner, J. Phys. B **47**, 185302 (2014).
[30] Y. Castin, private communication.
[31] J. Levinsen, N. R. Cooper, and V. Gurarie, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 063616 (2008).
[32] B. R. Johnson, J. Chem. Phys. **73**, 5051 (1980).
[33] B. Lepetit, Z. Peng, A. Kuppermann, Chem. Phys. Lett. **166**, 572 (1990).
[34] C. D. Lin, Phys. Rep. **257**, 1 (1995).
[35] H. Suno and B. D. Esry, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 062701 (2008).
[36] J. Wang, J. P. D'Incao and C. H. Greene Phys. Rev. A **84**, 052721 (2011).
[37] J. P. D'Incao and B. D. Esry, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 042707 (2014).
[38] J. P. D'Incao, F. Anis, and B. D. Esry, arXiv: 1411.2321.
[39] J. Wang, J. P. D'Incao, Y. Wang and C. H. Greene, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 062511 (2012).
[40] U. Fano, Phys. Rev. **124**, 1866 (1961).
[41] K. Martiyanov, V. Makhalov, and A. Turlapov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 030404 (2010).
[42] P. Dyke, E. D. Kuhnle, S. Whitlock, H. Hu, M. Mark, S. Hoinka, M. Lingham, P. Hannaford, C.J. Vale, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 105304 (2011).
[43] B. Fröhlich, M. Feld, E. Vogt, M. Koschorreck, W. Zwerger, and M. Köhl, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 105301 (2011).